



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/319,243

08/05/1999

PING LIONG TJOA

2663

23364 7590 04/28/2009

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, LALITA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3691

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/28/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09319243	8/5/99	TJOA, PING LIONG	

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-1176

EXAMINER

Lalita M. Hamilton

ART UNIT	PAPER
3691	20090426

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In response to the Board remand mailed on February 12, 2009, the declarations filed on August 28, 2006 are found to be insufficient for the following reasons:

The declarations filed under 37 CFR 1.132 filed August 28, 2006 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 17-21 based upon the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claim 17 Bosko in view of Callier and claims 19-21 Bosko in view of Jackson as set forth in the last Office action because: The declarations do not specifically demonstrate how a prima facie case of obviousness has not been proven. The Appellant submitted declarations showing how the apparatus is utilized and information concerning the apparatus as tested by users and feedback; however, the submissions do not present direct evidence sufficient to overcome the combination of elements disclosed by Bosko and taught by Callier and Jackson. Therefore, the declarations are insufficient.

In view of the foregoing, when all of the evidence is considered, the totality of the rebuttal evidence of nonobviousness fails to outweigh the evidence of obviousness.

/Lalita M Hamilton/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691